

UNCLASSIFIED

H37

ACTION WHA-00

RELEASED IN FULL

INFO	LOG-00	AID-00	AMAD-00	A-00	INL-00	PDI-00	DS-00
	EAP-00	UTED-00	TEDE-00	INR-00	IO-00	LAB-01	L-00
	OIC-00	OIG-00	NIMA-00	PA-00	PM-00	GIWI-00	IRM-00
	BBG-00	R-00	ECA-00	IIP-00	PMB-00	DSCC-00	DRL-00
	SAS-00	/001W					

-----61C9FE 211820Z /38

O 211816Z NOV 05  
FM AMEMBASSY OTTAWA  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 0613  
INFO CIA WASHDC  
DEPT OF TREASURY WASHDC  
USDOC WASHDC  
DIA WASHDC  
SECDEF WASHDC  
USNMR SHAPE BE  
WHITE HOUSE WASHDC  
ALL CANADIAN POSTS COLLECTIVE

UNCLAS OTTAWA 003446

STATE FOR WHA/CAN, WHA/PDA  
WHITE HOUSE PASS NSC/WEUROPE; NCS/WHA

E.O. 12958: N/A  
TAGS: KPAO, KMDR, OIIP, OPRC, CA

SUBJECT: MEDIA REACTION: WAR ON TERROR; WESTERN  
HEMISPHERE

## WAR ON TERROR

1. "Bush, betrayal and squandered trust"  
Washington correspondent Paul Koring wrote the following analysis in the leading Globe and Mail (11/17): "George W. Bush's global anti-terror edifice of secret prisons, stripped rights and midnight renditions, erected in haste and fear in the aftermath of Sept. 11, 2001, is now under concerted attack on multiple fronts from civil-rights groups, political opponents and even some in his own party. Much of what the U.S. President built - the Draconian Patriot Act; secret detention centres in extralegal, if not illegal, twilight zones; 'extraordinary renditions' (extraditing suspects across international boundaries without following normal court procedures) - rested on a deep foundation of trust. A shaken U.S. population was willing to accept that extraordinary measures and tactics were needed to safeguard the nation from a new

UNCLASSIFIED

## UNCLASSIFIED

and deadly enemy that didn't play by the old rules of war. More than four years later, the President appears to have squandered that trust. Americans feel increasingly betrayed by a government that led them to war on what now seem to be false - and perhaps deliberately false - pretenses. It is a reality that, if he cannot reverse it, leaves the U.S. President badly weakened, without the long coattails he might otherwise offer candidates in the midterm election and the next presidential vote.... Many Americans now believe the President, or at least those who surround him in the White House, lied to them: lied about the reasons for launching a war to topple Saddam Hussein, lied about the dirty-tricks campaigns to discredit opponents and lied about whether a blind eye was being turned to the torture of captives. Blaming rogue soldiers and denying a policy of torture is no longer enough for many Americans...."

### 2. "Bush besieged"

Editorialist Serge Truffaut wrote in the liberal *Le Devoir* (11/17): "These days, the American Senate is very hostile towards the White House concerning Iraq.... This is calculated in part [because of upcoming elections for a third of Senate seats and the decline in popularity of President Bush].... However, let's remember that certain members of the [Republican] party have supported the series of measures...in particular...torture.... [McCain's] victories [concerning the respect of the Geneva Convention on the treatment of prisoners] are a snub to the whole Executive Branch.... If Bush overthrows McCain, the image of the U.S. will be tarnished for a long time."

## WESTERN HEMISPHERE

### 3. "Days of our softwood"

The leading *Globe and Mail* opined (11/17): "In the long-running soap opera of softwood lumber, there has seldom been a week with so many confusing episodes. First, the World Trade Organization loftily declared that the United States had properly evaluated the threat to its softwood industry from Canadian exports. The U.S. crowed with delight: Aha, there is a threat, so duties are justified. Yesterday, a North American free-trade agreement panel grumpily told the U.S. that it has seven days to redo its calculation of the amount by which Canada allegedly subsidizes the industry. Canada chortled with glee: Aha, when those new figures are produced, the amount of the so-called subsidy will shrink to virtually nothing - so U.S. duties must drop.

UNCLASSIFIED

## UNCLASSIFIED

Qshrink to virtually nothing - so U.S. duties must drop. What is going on? In strictly legal terms, Canada is besting the United States. But the storyline is complicated. Trade disputes at the WTO and NAFTA take place around three issues, often simultaneously: the existence of government subsidies, the possibility that private companies are dumping goods into foreign markets at prices below fair value, and the injury to domestic industry from those two practices.... It is up to the United States to make the next move. After losing so often where it really counts, at NAFTA, the U.S. must make a gesture of good faith - and wrench this dispute from the clutches of the powerful U.S. softwood industry. There has to be a high-level signal of compromise. Otherwise, this serial will outlast

everyone."

#### 4. "Two-track plan derails"

The liberal Toronto Star editorialized (11/17):

"...Although the Canadian government has consistently won its case against U.S. lumber tariffs under the North American Free Trade Agreement's dispute settlement rules, it suffered a loss this week under World Trade Organization rules. From the United States' perspective, that means it's a draw, which gives Washington an excuse to keep dragging out the dispute, even though a NAFTA panel yesterday ordered the American administration to rework the calculations for the tariff by next week. To no one's surprise, U.S. Trade Representative Rob Portman used the WTO decision to argue that Ottawa should stop fighting, and simply accept a negotiated settlement. For his part, Canada's Trade Minister Jim Peterson argued that a NAFTA ruling banning the U.S. lumber tariffs last August ought to take precedence:... Also, why go to the WTO at all when Peterson says the NAFTA arena is the one that counts? Simply put, what percentage was there for Canada to raise the odds of giving the Americans the excuse they sought on the off-chance that Canada could secure a double win - when a single, clear-cut victory would have sufficed?

To take a double-barrelled shotgun approach to the softwood lumber dispute was a poor strategy for Ottawa when a rifle was clearly called for. Now Canada's lumber industry will probably have to keep paying for that mistake even though the rules governing two-way trade between Canada and the U.S. make it clear that Peterson is absolutely right."

UNCLASSIFIED

## UNCLASSIFIED

### 5. "Our next PM: Stephen Harper"

Columnist Andrew Coyne speculated in the conservative National Post (11/17): "I wonder if anyone fully realizes what happened last weekend. The political ground has just shifted beneath our feet, even if the tremors are not felt until after the election. Which is to say: Sunday's agreement among the three opposition leaders has not just put an end to this government. It has also chosen the next. Jack Layton has just made Stephen Harper the next prime minister. The NDP leader's decision to break with the Liberals would be momentous enough in its own right. It was clearly only taken after some considerable internal debate, measuring the delights of extorting more spending out of a weak and desperate government against the dangers of being too closely associated with a party that has become a byword for corruption. So Mr. Layton's eventual declaration was firm and unequivocal. His party can no longer support the Liberals. But this is the point: Having crossed that Rubicon, he cannot uncross it.... It doesn't matter which party, Liberal or Conservative, wins the most seats. Suppose the standings after the election are exactly the same as they are now, that is with the Liberals having a plurality. It would be as clear then as it is today that the Liberals did not enjoy the confidence of the House, and could not form a government. Like the NDP, the Governor-General would have no choice but to call upon Mr. Harper. Does that make the election irrelevant? Yes and no. Everyone says an election won't change anything: that it will just be another minority government. But in fact it changes everything, because it will be a minority government.... Isn't it possible Mr. Layton might go back to supporting the Liberals, if QMr. Layton might go back to supporting the Liberals, if they made him a sufficiently generous offer? Yes it's possible. But why would he? Not only would he make himself an utter laughingstock, popping back in power the same parcel of rogues he had just removed from it, but he would be closing off a historic opportunity for the NDP.... It may be that what we are witnessing is in fact a long-term strategic shift by the NDP, with Gomery as the trigger. Perhaps Mr. Layton sensed a dynasty collapsing, and the possibilities that would open up for the NDP in its wake. Perhaps he could see the Liberals are finished."

WILKINS

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

NNNN

UNCLASSIFIED